

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 738

FL 015 409

AUTHOR Betancourt, Francisco
TITLE Puerto Rican Spanish: Linguistic Insecurity.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Error Patterns; Ethnic Groups; Grammatical Acceptability; *Language Attitudes; Language Variation; *Nonstandard Dialects; *Puerto Ricans; Regional Dialects; School Surveys; Secondary Education; *Self Esteem; Social Dialects; Socioeconomic Status; *Spanish; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS *Linguistic Insecurity

ABSTRACT

The three conditions given in the literature for the pervasiveness of linguistic insecurity (a speaker's attitude toward his or her own speech revealed in face to face interaction through the upward or downward shift of language forms) exist in the case of speakers of the Spanish vernacular of Puerto Rico. The conditions are: the rise of a middle class, a fossilized language curriculum, and a dialect stereotyped as inferior. A study of the latent attitudes of insecurity manifested by 104 teachers and students in 3 public high schools on the island assessed such factors as the following: the perceived social status of the students and teachers; student attitudes toward teachers as linguistic role models; attitudes about correctness and the tendency towards hypercorrection; and the prestige of language varieties spoken by various social, occupational, and national groups, including the subjects' own. The survey found the subjects to be generally insecure, particularly at the lexical level of language structure. No significant interaction of the linguistic variables related to linguistic insecurity occurred between or within the subject groups, although they showed a defensive ethnic stance about their linguistic insecurity.
(Author/MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED265738

PUERTO RICAN SPANISH:
LINGUISTIC INSECURITY

Francisco Betancourt

Department of English
The University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez

ABSTRACT

The three conditions that research literature posits for the pervasiveness of linguistic insecurity obtain on the island of Puerto Rico: the rise of a middle class, a fossilized language curriculum, and a dialect stereotyped as inferior. This study is a small section of a larger study reporting language attitudes and opinions in Puerto Rico. This paper reports the latent attitudes of insecurity manifested by a sample 104 teachers and students from three public high schools on the island, in answers to the questionnaire of the study. The essential research question focused on the Subjects' reactions to their insecurity. They showed themselves to be generally insecure, as assumed in the study, particularly at the lexical level of language structure. No significant interaction of the linguistic variables related to linguistic insecurity occurred between or within the groups of subjects, though they showed a defensive ethnic stance toward their linguistic insecurity. (Puerto Rican Spanish, social class, language attitudes, linguistic insecurity, doctrine of correctness, linguistic variation, Spanish dialectology)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Francisco Betancourt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL015409

INTRODUCTION

This paper represents a small section of a larger study designed to explore the opinions and attitudes that Puerto Rican subjects (Ss) on the island of Puerto Rico hold toward their use of the Spanish vernacular. Though the authors who have described Puerto Rican Spanish (PRS) have focused on language contact with English in Puerto Rico, on borrowing, on creolization, and so forth (Betancourt 1985), other authors and theorists have proposed the analysis of speakers' attitudes toward language use (Hoenigswald 1964, Halliday 1968, Fishman 1971, and Hymes 1972) as opposed to studies limited to borrowing or the comparative description of languages as monolithic entities. The study deals with language attitudes in general and with attitudes of linguistic insecurity in particular.

The purpose of the present study was threefold: to determine the linguistic level at which the Puerto Rican Ss felt most insecure, to explore the participants' response to the "doctrine of correctness," and to determine the Ss' reaction to their linguistic insecurity. The area of reactions to linguistic insecurity is important in Puerto Rico because students are invariably blamed for the misuse of language, yet the Spanish courses fail to provide a sense of security in language use. Both linguistic insecurity and the doctrine of correctness were assumed to pervade the island because the three conditions that the research literature posits for the emergence of linguistic insecurity obtain in Puerto Rico: (a) the rise of a middle class (Leonard 1962, Labov 1966), (b) a fossilized language curriculum (Baron 1976), and (c) a dialect stereotyped as inferior (Baron 1976). A probable fourth cause for linguistic insecurity is a recent colonial past that makes the mother country a strong influence on language norms. Such is the case in Puerto Rico, where *la madre España* 'mother Spain' weighs heavily on the island's use of language norms. Thus, the Castilian pronunciation for *corazón*

'heart' [koræón] is considered more "correct" 100% of the time (Betancourt & Phinney 1985) than the Latin American [korasón].

The first three conditions will be discussed below in reference to Puerto Rico.

The first condition for the existence of an attitude of linguistic insecurity is the rise of a middle class. Quintero Rivera ([1972] 1974:207) views the rise of the middle class in Puerto Rico as "a historical formation, not as a statistical occupational category, not as a thing that is, but as a phenomenon that happens." Quintero Rivera states that in the 40s, as a result of the industrialization process the social structure of Puerto Rico began to change at the middle. A small group of islanders became industrialists or merchants along American lines, linked to the socioeconomic organization of the United States. Other processes of the 40s, such as the emergence of the subgroups of veterans from World War II and the Korean War, impelled the rise of a middle class. Many of these veterans, according to Quintero Rivera (p. 206) were of plantation-proletariat origin who made use of the Veteran's Administration facilities to buy cars and become publico drivers,² to buy or start small businesses, and to purchase homes in new middle class housing developments. Gradually, these veterans separated from their class of origin to become members of the new middle class.

Paraphrasing Muñoz Hernández, Lewis (1974:458) portrays the new Puerto Rican middle class unattractively as

. . . the nouveaux riches, only a brief generation away from the cane fields. They are desperately anxious to forget that background, terribly afraid that any moment they may relapse back into it. They are profoundly class-conscious; they hate and fear the poor; they evince attitudes of extreme servility to those above them in the social scale; they estimate everybody in terms of their material possessions; they almost literally wallow in a life-style of vulgar conspicuous consumption; everything admirable or desirable bears the stamp of being made in the United States. They see education for their children not as an intellectually emancipating

experience but as a mechanism of social mobility. They are politically reactionary. Above all, they are ideologically parasitical, for they see everything they possess as coming from the largesse of the American metropolis; in Muñoz Hernández' phrase, they have a sort of Santa Claus vision of social reality, believing good behavior will bring the gift of prosperity, bad behavior the punishment of poverty. This is a class, that is to say, that is neither the classic Marxian bourgeoisie, characterised by its relationship to the means of production, nor the classic Weberian middle class, characterised by comforting attitudes of social status. It is, rather, a vulgarized, bogus middle class.

Regardless of how the new middle class of Puerto Rico is described, such a middle class does exist and linguistic insecurity along with it.

In addition to the rise of the middle class as a source of linguistic insecurity, another cause of linguistic insecurity is that the language in question is characterized as inferior. Although the majority of studies dealing with PRS lack rigor and objectivity, no country in Latin America has been as extensively researched sociologically and linguistically as the island of Puerto Rico, nor has any other Hispanic dialect been as emphatically stereotyped as inferior. For example, the language has been reported as inadequate as a medium of school instruction (Clark 1900); it has been considered diglossic with the rest of the Hispanic world (Sereno 1949; Bram 1966); it has been denounced as a monostylistic, dying language (Sereno 1949, Arce 1950, de Granda 1969, Morris 1981); it was the object of the first linguistic atlas in Latin America and was found to have had a "notorious descent" (Navarro [1927] 1966); it has been the object of language contact studies with English and found "corrupted" by contact (Dillard 1969); it has been characterized as a creole and found useless for the formulation of thoughts (Lawton 1971). One author even said that "Spanish is putrifying in Puerto Rico" (de Madariaga 1966). Though these studies downgrade PRS because of language contact, no study has dealt with linguistic insecurity on the island. Language contact alone, without an attitude of linguistic insecurity,

is insufficient to occasion a linguistic change.

Given these statements cited above, which stereotype PRS as inferior, linguistic insecurity must be assumed to be prevalent on the island.

The third condition for the existence of linguistic insecurity is the quality of the school curriculum. A S of this study expressed the thought that the Spanish language curriculum, whatever its content, was fossilized in the 40s. However, Carrasquillo (1980:10) stated that even before 1890, when Puerto Rico became a possession of the U.S., the island did not have a specific language curriculum for Spanish. Curricular programs "consisted of a group of different methods and techniques," with few books in use. In 1920, when Puerto Rico had not yet developed its own philosophy of education, the secondary school was largely an imitation of the high school in the United States; Spanish was not given much importance and as late as 1931 a formal curriculum for Spanish did not exist.

The Columbia University curriculum survey (1950) of public schools in Puerto Rico stated that, "in Spanish, more emphasis is placed on the mechanics of writing, grammar, dictation, and penmanship than on the ideas the children are trying to express" (p. 173). And, Martin-Betancourt (1984:9) stated in her review of the Spanish curriculum on the island that although the Columbia study, with suggestions for curriculum development in Spanish in Puerto Rico, was published in 1949, the curriculum was not revised until the late 60s. Even now, the approach of the Spanish curriculum retains its traditional literary and grammatical focus. The Spanish curriculum of the University of Puerto Rico bears a strong resemblance to that of the schools in its emphasis on literature and grammar. This similarity can be understood in view of academic inbreeding; the university curriculum was developed and implemented by professors who received their education in the schools of Puerto Rico, and, in turn, taught future school teachers.

In summary, given that the Spanish curriculum has not changed in the past eighty-five years in Puerto Rico, that a new middle class rose during that time, and that the Puerto Rican Spanish linguistic code has consistently been stereotyped as inferior, linguistic insecurity must be assumed to exist on the island.

Given these social and educational conditions above, the researcher hypothesized that the Ss of the study would show a high degree of linguistic insecurity, particularly because most of the Ss of this study avowed membership (94.23%) in the middle class, in which linguistic insecurity is believed to be more prevalent.

Review of related literature. Even before the rise of the Puerto Rican middle class in the 40s, Navarro ([1927] 1966) had alluded, though by another name, to the existence of linguistic insecurity on the island of Puerto Rico. Because Navarro was writing twenty-eight years after the Spanish occupation of Puerto Rico, one could posit a colonial past as a contributor to linguistic insecurity in the provinces. More recently, Cedergren (1965) alluded to linguistic insecurity on the island.

Leonard (1962) traced the origin of linguistic insecurity to the rise of the middle class of seventeenth and eighteenth century England, a period when the newly risen British middle class, finding their speech patterns inappropriate to some language situations, began to demand language "rules" to guide them in their use of English. The demand of the middle class for normative speech rules became known as "the doctrine of correctness" (see below).

Linguistic insecurity is a speaker's attitude toward his or her own speech, revealed in face to face interaction through the upward or downward shift of language forms. Speakers may adjust their language forms upward to those which they consider of higher linguistic prestige, or occasionally, they

shift downward to accomodate their speech to that of the interlocutor. Linguistic insecurity studies focus on speakers' attitude toward "right" and "wrong" speech, which cause them to adjust their speech forms to those they consider more "correct," whether the shift is downward or upward. Because the linguistic forms are unstable in the speech of the speakers, and therefore shift, the speakers are said to be insecure. Baron (1976:1) says that in the United States

Linguistic insecurity is the feeling that many if not all Americans have that their language is somehow not quite up to snuff, that it is out of control--riddled with errors--or simply unskillful and gauche: the commas spoken or witten, come in all the wrong places. It is a feeling of guilt that is sometimes conscious, often not, and its effects are sometimes trivial, occasionally distressing. It drives ordinary folks being introduced to English teachers to exclaim, "Oh, you're an English teacher? I guess I better watch my grammar." And it drives students in Descriptive Grammar courses to demand that we tell them where to put their commas.

Baron (1976) suggests that linguistic insecurity can manifest itself at times through speakers' stopping their conversation because they feel inadequate in their speech. Very likely, the speakers' cognitive load in processing the appropriate speech form to a particular occasion causes them to stop talking. At other times, speakers may hypercorrect their speech forms, becoming more correct than correct, exceeding correctness. Such hypercorrection may be heard in Puerto Rican Spanish (PRS) in words like *bacalado < bacalao 'codfish', *hesnia < hernia 'rupture', or *murlo < muslo 'thigh'. One well known example of hypercorrection in English was that in which President Dwight Eisenhower thanked people, while on national TV, for "what they had done for Mamie and I" [me]. Apparently, for insecure speakers, me is a less prestigious form of I, as who is the less prestigious form of whom-- both me and who are occasionally hypercorrected.

Hypercorrection, may alter the course of a language (Baron 1976:1) or

cause linguistic change (Labov 1966). Baron gives two causes for an attitude of linguistic insecurity: the stereotyping of dialects, a phenomenon noticed in Puerto Rico (Betancourt 1976), and "an educational system based on the doctrine of correctness and purity of language" (another phenomenon which occurs doubly in Puerto Rico because of the island's bilingual nature and school instruction). For example, as stated by the participants in the present study, teachers of Spanish or English in Puerto Rico frequently begin their respective school semesters by telling their students that they, the students, don't know Spanish or don't know English. The same students may also hear a history teacher tell them that they don't know Spanish or English.

For Labov (1966:479), linguistic insecurity pervasively affects all social classes in New York City, particularly the lower middle class. "Linguistic insecurity is perhaps an inevitable accompaniment of social mobility and the development of upward social aspirations in terms of the socio-economic hierarchy" (Labov 1966:475).

D'Anglejan and Tucker (1973), whose study of French in Quebec is partially replicated here, found evidence of linguistic insecurity in responses to two questions: (a) if the Ss would accept correction of their speech from other Quebecois speakers or from speakers of European French and (b) if the Ss desired to sound "correct" or to sound Quebecois. From the Ss' answers, d'Anglejan and Tucker concluded that the desire to sound "correct" proved the Ss' linguistic insecurity, overshadowing the Ss' desire to sound Quebecois.

Because the middle class of Puerto Rico is a recent sociological phenomenon (Quintero Rivera 1974:195-213), and because the subjects of this study placed themselves in the middle class, the investigator expected that the participants would give indications of a high incidence of linguistic insecurity related to such social variables as age, socioeconomic status,

gender, and so on. Abraham and Troike (1972: 142) state that gender is a social variable effecting linguistic insecurity:

Previous investigations have found in the Anglo-American society that females are much more sensitive to social class variation and are more likely to adopt middle-class speech norms, while males reject these norms as effeminate and seek their own social identity in the maintenance of non-standard forms.

The findings of social variables, such as gender, as sources of linguistic insecurity in adult females were corroborated as early as 1958 by Fisher's findings with children, which showed that "female speakers are more socially sensitive (insecure?) and use a higher percentage of 'formal' or 'careful' forms than do male speakers" (p.150).

This study assumes linguistic insecurity to pervade the island and focuses on the Ss' attitudinal stance toward that insecurity.

METHODS

The design for this study was similar to one carried out by d'Anglejan and Tucker (1973), though their subjects (Ss) were French speakers from Quebec and the Ss of this study are Spanish speakers from Puerto Rico.

Subjects. This study was based on a parallel sample of 104 high school teachers and students from three public high schools in Puerto Rico, divided into four cells of 26 Ss each. The population of teachers and students was chosen because that population would be more representative of middle class attitudes toward language than would a more heterogeneous population. The teachers and students were group tested in their schools.

Materials. For this study, the investigator designed a number of questions in whose answers the Ss would manifest their linguistic insecurity; the questions were based on the various possible sources of linguistic insecurity. The researcher wanted to find out, for example, the Ss' reaction to standard speech in relation to their own, to the comparative beauty of one language

dialect over another, and the Ss' perception of the linguistic level at which they felt most/least insecure.

RESULTS

Linguistic insecurity. The first question asked the Ss was if people made fun of others who spoke Spanish well (Table 1).

Table 1. Do people make fun of others who speak well?

	T	S	Total
M $\bar{X}$ 93	77	170	
$\bar{X}$ (3.6)	(2.96)		
F $\bar{X}$ 77	104	181	
$\bar{X}$ (2.96)	(4.0)		
Total	170	181	251 = (3.4)

Legend: M= Male F= Female
T= Teacher S= Student

This question took into account the well-known Puerto Rican custom of burlesquing the speech of those who try to use the speech style of a social class higher than their own. For example, a speaker using hypercorrection might be said to be \$fisnudo (<fin> 'fine' in his or her speech. The term fisnudo used to describe the hypercorrect speaker is itself a hypercorrected form which may also appear as \$fisno, or as \$finudo. All the three term derived from the difficulty of retrieving in the dialect the underlying deleted segments g or g. Speaking well, therefore, constrained and dichotomized the speech of town vs. country, or the educated vs. the uneducated.

In answer to the question of whether people made fun of the those who spoke Spanish well, hablar fino, the Ss concurred on a scale of 7 ($\bar{X}$ =3.4) that

people who spoke well were not made fun of, although the female students gave a neutral answer to the question. Thus, overt social pressure for linguistic conformity is not perceived by the Ss. No significant interaction occurred among or within groups.

The second question was based on the Ss' perception of the normative influence of Spain upon the Spanish of Puerto Rico. The Ss were asked to respond to the cliché that the best Spanish is spoken in Spain. The Ss concurred (Table 2) with the cliché that the best Spanish is spoken in Spain ($\bar{X}=3.2$, on a scale of 7, where 1 = high and 7 = low).

Table 2. The best Spanish is spoken in Spain

	MS	FS	MT	FT	Total
ΣX	77	77	100	78	332
$\bar{X}$	2.96	2.96	3.85	3.0	3.2

$$F = 2.89, df = 3/100, p < .05$$

Noticeable in the table above is the difference between the scores of the male teachers and the other groups. The MTs are of the opinion that the Spanish of Spain is not the best, yet they agree that it is good. They do not disagree with the other Ss; they just dissent more. This dissension is repeated throughout the study. Dissension of this type is seen in this study as linguistic bravado. The opinion that the language is spoken better elsewhere is a sign of linguistic insecurity. There was no major interaction among or within groups in the Ss' answers.

A third question, comparable to the one above, probed the Ss' reaction to the idea of one variety of a language having more beauty than another, not if one were better than another, as asked above. The Ss were asked if PRS was uglier than any other Hispanic dialect. Though the investigator expected the

Ss to answer negatively, the consensus was on the neutral (4) point of the scale (Table 3).

Table 3. PRS is uglier than any other Hispanic dialect

	MS	FS	MT	FT	Total
ΣX	133	128	123	131	515
$\bar{X}$	5.1	4.9	4.7	5.0	4.93

$$F = .31, df = 3/100, p < .05$$

The fourth question asked the Ss to state their opinion of the cliché, often repeated in the PRS literature, that PRS is the worst Spanish of the Hispanic world. The Ss, reflecting ethnic pride, totally disagreed (Table 4) with the cliché. The male teachers disagreed more with the cliché than did the other groups, but not significantly so.

Table 4. PRS is the worst of the Hispanic world

	MS	FS	MT	FT	Total
ΣX	153	141	160	126	580
$\bar{X}$	5.9	5.4	6.2	4.85	5.6

$$F = 2.53, df = 3/100, p < .05$$

The fifth question asked whether the Ss were satisfied with the Spanish they spoke. All Ss appeared to be satisfied ($\bar{X}=2.7$) with their Spanish (Table 5), with the male Ss being more positive than the female Ss, a finding which corroborates Fisher's finding that females are usually less secure linguistically than men are.

Table 5: Are you satisfied with the Spanish you speak?
(Means reported in parentheses)

	T	S	Total
M	62 (2.4)	70 (2.7)	132
F	73 (2.8)	79 (3.0)	152
Total	135	149	284 = (2.7)

The Ss later responded to a comparable question which asked them to report how their personal speech style differed from or was similar to that which they admired. The question tested the assumption that admiration reflects acceptability and the desire to emulate and acceptable, prestigious forms (Table 6). Question six assumed a considerable degree of metalinguistic sensitivity on the part of the Ss, an assumption based on the Ss' avowed devotion to TV (on an earlier question), where most Hispanic speech styles are presented (i.e. the Hispanic novelas 'soap operas').

Table 6. How does your speech differ from that
which you most admire?
(Reported in percentages, n=192)

Source of Variation	MS	FS	MT	FT	Total	Rank
By Vocabulary	4.7	5.7	5.2	6.3	21.9	1
By Intonation	3.2	5.7	5.7	4.6	19.2	2
By Pronunciation	4.6	6.3	1.6	6.3	18.8	3
Mine is the same	4.6	4.1	7.3	2.2	18.2	4
Admire no Other	3.7	3.7	4.1	4.1	15.6	5
By Grammar	2.6	2.6	0.0	1.1	6.3	6
Total	23.4	28.1	23.9	24.6	100.00	

In answer to the question, the female Ss claimed more often than did the males that their speech differed from the one they admired. Table 6 above indicates in percentages the perceived variations of styles, in ranked order. All the Ss concurred that their personal speech differed from the one

they admired by (1) vocabulary ($\bar{X}=21.9\%$), by (2) intonation ($\bar{X}=19.2\%$), by (3) pronunciation ($\bar{X}=18.8\%$), and by (4) grammar last (6.3%), in that order (where $n=192$).

On the same question, those who admired no other form of speech ranked fifth, below those who found fault with their speech ($\bar{X}=15.67\%$), or those who felt their personal speech to be equal to that which they admired (18.2%). The Ss considered grammar as the least deviant linguistic level in their use of Spanish (6.3%); and it was therefore the language level at which they felt the least insecure. In other words, linguistic insecurity is much more common in the Puerto Rican middle class Ss of this study in the areas of lexicon (vocabulary) pronunciation, and intonation than in grammar. The Ss were very consistent in their answers, both among and within groups.

In order to probe the Ss' linguistic insecurity, they were asked to rank a number of island occupations in the order of their social prestige (Table 7). The Ss were later asked to form speech reference groups using those same occupations (Table 8).

Table 7: Mean rating for each occupation on the prestige scale

	Students		Teachers		Rank
	M	F	M	F	
Medical Doctors	2.4	2.6	1.7	1.5	1
Lawyers	2.0	2.1	2.5	2.2	2
Professors	3.7	2.2	3.0	2.8	3
Priests	5.3	5.2	4.3	4.5	4
Teachers	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.9	5
Bank Clerks	5.8	5.9	6.2	5.9	6
TV Commentators	6.1	4.5	6.0	6.5	7
Mechanics	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.0	8
Publico Drivers	10.8	9.6	8.96	9.4	9
Workers	9.0	8.6	9.9	10.1	10
Janitors	8.3	10.3	10.5	10.2	11

As shown in Table 7, the Ss ranked the medical doctors at the top of the

prestige scale and the janitors at the bottom. The teachers, on the other hand, were ranked fifth on the prestige scale, close to the middle of the scale.

The eighth question on linguistic insecurity asked the Ss to make speech reference groups from the same list of unordered island occupations presented in Table 7 above, with two added categories, politicians and jibaros 'white mountaineers.'

Table 8: Speech groups by occupation

MS	FS	MT	FT	AVE.
3.3	4.3	2.9	3.3	3.5

Upper Group	Middle Group	Lower Group
Lawyers	Ss themselves	Publico Drivers
*Politicians	Bank Clerks	Janitors
MDs	*TV Commentators	Mechanics
College Profs.	--	Workers
--	--	*Jibaros

*Classified tautologically: classification probably made on the dependent variable of language itself.

The average number of groups made by the Ss was three ($\bar{X}=3.46$), an interesting number because it indicated that the Ss perceived their society as tripartite, with their own social class in the middle (Table 8). The number of speech reference groups ranged from the male teachers' low of 2.9 and the female teachers' high of 4.3, for an average of 3.46 groups. The mean of 3.46 corroborates Tumin and Feldman's findings which states the Puerto Ricans view their society as tripartite. This study showed that the Ss view their society as tripartite both socially and linguistically.

Table 8 shows that the Ss' upper speech level group was distinctly comprised of lawyers, politicians, medical doctors, and college professors.

In the lower speech group, the Ss clearly perceived the publico drivers, janitors, mechanics, workers, and the jibaros--though jibaro is not an occupational category. The Ss placed themselves in the middle group, which represents the middle class. The Ss placed themselves, along with the bank clerks and TV commentators. A subgroup of teachers placed themselves fourth in the higher status group they had themselves formed-- with the lawyers first, with the bank clerks second, and with the college professors third. The TV commentators and the jibaro were most often grouped by themselves.

On the table above, the TV commentators and politicians were tautologically place in different groups. TV commentators constitute an ambiguous occupation (Blishen 1968) and appeared ambiguously placed within the the speech reference groups of this study. The ambiguous classification of the lawyers was reflected in another section of this study where the lawyers, many of whom are also politicians, have developed a distinctive speech style for public occasion which the Ss termed as demagogue.

The Ss' classification of occupations into speech groups depended on criteria derived from their individual perceptions of speech in relation to social class, thus different Ss could place the occupations in different groups. Perhaps the criterion for the classification of occupations into speech groups was based on the dependent variable of language itself rather than on extraverbal behavior. Only through interviews with the Ss could their classificatory scheme have been clarified as to the judgment they used about a person's speech to categorize that person socially or occupationally.

The Puerto Rican Ss, however, were very consistent in their answers to the two questions and their answers corroborated similar findings in New York (Labov 1966:475). The students, for example, viewed the group of teachers as belonging to the higher reference group, with lawyers first and bank clerks closely in second place, and with the college professors in the third place.

Students ranked teachers as teachers rank themselves, upwardly. The inclusion of bank clerks, which is an ambiguous category in the Blisshen (1968) scale, can only be explained by the Puerto Ricans' exclusive social prestige accorded to bank clerks. Evidently, the social history of Puerto Rico is reflected in the attitude expressed by the Ss of this study. Sociologically, the Puerto Rican occupational transition has proceeded from farm hand to "cleaner" occupations, such as publico driver and the comparatively more prestigious bank clerk occupation. In that occupational hierarchy, a clerk has arrived at an occupation where he does not have to ensuciarse las manos 'get one's hands dirty'. Thus, that occupation has in modern Puerto Rico an ambiguous appeal.

Linguistic insecurity in the student Ss appeared more marked than in the teachers. The students placed themselves downward in the speech reference group of publico drivers (ranked 9th), though not as low as they placed liberos. Perhaps this placement is a reflection of language teaching in Puerto Rico which emphasizes students' deficiencies in vocabulary and grammar. Subsequent studies (Betancourt & Phinney 1985) have shown that an inverse relationship exists now between age and linguistic insecurity: the lower the age, the higher the insecurity.

The doctrine of correctness. The doctrine of correctness is that attitude which speakers have toward the purity of the language code. Speakers feel that the perfect form of their language exists elsewhere in its pure, pristine form. For example, the Ss of this study believed that the best Spanish is spoken in Spain, but that they themselves speak a corrupted form of Castilian Spanish. Therefore, they found the ceceo (the interdental realization of the graphemes s and z to be more correct than their realization as s. Thus, cinco 'five' is more correct as [θiŋko] than as [siŋko].

In the United States, "American insecurity about correctness is

notorious, for probably no other nation consults dictionaries so frequently" (Ferguson & Heath 1981). In Puerto Rico, the present study showed that the doctrine of correctness is a manifest concomitant to the island's recent colonial past, to the recent rise of a middle class, to a stigmatized dialect, and to a language curriculum based on the purity of the code. The doctrine of correctness in Puerto Rico is not always manifest; at times it appears disguised as "a doctrine of language nativization," whereby speakers excuse their use of nonstandard language forms on the grounds of ethnicity. For example, a performer at a party of college professors said that she had originally sung a particular song en las fiestas que ~~hubieron~~ [hubo] en . . . 'at the fiestas held at.' A professor in the audience prompted, loudly and rudely, the standard form for that context, hubo. The singer replied, Bueno, ~~hubieron~~, 'por aquello de ser puertorriqueño' 'Well, hubieron, by virtue of being Puerto Rican.' To the songstress' remark, a professor sitting next to me remarked, ¡Qué incultura! 'What ignorance!' The performer's remark showed a lack of overt adherence to a doctrine of correctness, which she excused ethnocentrically. Under the same circumstances, a more linguistically secure person would have excused herself and gone on. But, in this particular case, the singer attributed her use of nonstandard language to a national linguistic characteristic, implying that correct usage would have misrepresented her ethnic origin. However, the singer's remark also indicated that for her, Puerto Ricans are generally linguistically insecure: the singer's statement implied that if one is Puerto Rican, then one speaks incorrectly, or, conversely, that some speakers are more/less Puerto Rican in speech than others are.

The above anecdote has no place in serious research, but it leads to the question: do Puerto Ricans generally prefer speech correctness over the representation of Puerto Rican ethnicity? The question (ninth) asked the Ss

if they would prefer language correctness, in at least three levels of linguistic structure, over representation of their Puerto Rican ethnicity (Table 9).

Table 9. What is more important to you
pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, or ethnicity?

	MS	FS	MT	FT	Total	Percent
Pronunciation						
Close to spelling	17	15	12	19	63	60.5
Close to PRS	9	11	14	7	41	39.5
Total	26	26	26	26	104	100.0
Vocabulary						
As written	19	21	12	22	74	71.2
Close to PRS	7	5	14	4	30	28.8
Total	26	26	26	26	104	100.0
Grammar						
As written	24	22	17	25	88	84.6
Close to PRS	2	4	9	1	16	15.4
Total	26	26	26	26	104	100.0

The answer in Table 9 contradicted the songstress' statement and corroborated the empirical findings of d'Anglejan and Tucker (1973) for the Quebecois. The Puerto Rican Ss indicated that they would prefer correctness over ethnicity at all three levels of linguistic structure, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. Therefore, the statement por aquello de ser puertorriqueño seems more a linguistic bravado, a rationalization, than the singer's desire not to misrepresent herself linguistically. All Ss indicated that they would prefer correctness as in the written language over ethnic loyalty to PRS. The MTs, however, preferred ethnicity over correctness at all linguistic levels. This preference is another instance of male linguistic bravado, for the MTs do not hold that point of view consistently throughout the research. In general, the teachers and students downgrade their native PRS vis-a-vis other dialects of the Spanish language. Furthermore, the Ss

would prefer a pronunciation of Spanish close to the spelling of the language (60.5%), a vocabulary that is close to the written language (71.2%), and a use of grammar that is also close to that of the written language (84.6%).

Given the Ss' assumed overt and covert sensitivity to the doctrine of correctness, a series of questions were designed to probe the Ss' deference to the normative language opinions of others as well as the Ss' willingness to accept prescriptive correction of their use of Spanish.

The first question asked the Ss what their reaction would be to being corrected in their use of language (Table 10). The question presented five options: (a) not heed the correction, (b) correct themselves from then on, (c) get angry at being corrected, (d) thank the person for the correction, but not correct the speech habit subsequently, and (e) open-ended answer. The answers indicated (Table 10) that the Ss would not get angry at being corrected, whether by a peer, another Hispano, or a member of the Puerto Rican upper class, though these are not mutually exclusive categories. Instead, the Ss would heed the correction and change to the corrected linguistic habit from then on.

Table 10. Your reaction to being corrected
(Reported in percentages)

Reaction	A peer	Another Hispano	The upper class
Not heed	.68	4.2	3.9
Correct Myself	63.51	53.2	63.3
Get angry	0.0	.7	3.1
Not change	6.08	7.7	7.0
Other	<u>29.73</u>	<u>34.2</u>	<u>22.7</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Appeal to Authority	30.0	34.5	23.0

In general, the Ss indicated that they would heed other Hispanos less in

regard to normative correction than they would their peers or the Puerto Rican upper class. The Ss' linguistic insecurity became more apparent in their answers to the open-ended option (e); the most common write-in answer to the open ended option was "Appeals to authority." However, none of the Ss was able to name the specific authority they would consult, a grammar or a handbook of Spanish usage.

Evidently, because of the lack normative grammars and handbooks in school libraries, dialogar 'discuss' comes first in language issues in Puerto Rico, whereas the dictionary is first in the United States. In talking to the Ss, the researcher became aware that the students were unaware of the existence of Spanish grammar books other than their classroom texts. Furthermore, such books are rarely available in school libraries.² In the absence of such written grammar texts, the Spanish teacher is the chief language authority in the schools. However, in response to an earlier question in this study, all teachers saw themselves first in rank ($\bar{X}=1.6$, on a scale of 7) as the entities who should be in charge of bettering and preserving the Spanish language in Puerto Rico. The students did not accord them this rank but placed all teachers second in rank ($\bar{X}=2.3$), with 100% consensus from all the students.

In another question, the Ss were asked whom they would rather accept correction from, whether their peers, the Puerto Rican upper class, or other Hispanos, and the frequency with which they would appeal to external authorities.

Based on the sociological finding of Tumin and Feldman (1971) on interclass relations in Puerto Rico, the researcher hypothesized that linguistically as well as sociologically, the Ss would value the normative opinion of the Puerto Rican upper class first, the opinion of their peers second, and the opinions of other Hispanos third. The findings of the research showed an order of preferences similar to that of Tumin and Feldman's

sociological research: the Ss would accept normative language correction from the upper class first, their peers second, and from other Hispanos third. The Ss would rather accept correction from the Puerto Rican upper class than from other Hispanos, and they would appeal less to handbooks and grammars, in accepting correction from the Puerto Rican upper class than in accepting correction from other Hispanos. In addition, the Ss indicated that they would accept correction by a peer 63.51% of the time, with 30% frequency in appeal to normative language authorities. The Ss would accept correction from a member of the upper class 63.3% of the time, with 23% appeals to normative authority. However, they would accept correction from another Hispano only 53.2% of the time, with an increase in the appeal to prescriptive authorities to 34.5%. In all instances, the Ss stated that they would accept prescriptions in language use, with the caveats of discussing the correction and finding a source of authority. Interestingly, the Ss would heed the upper class and their peers equally, but they distrust their peers more in language issues than they do the upper class--a sign of linguistic "persuit" by the lower middle class.

Conclusions. The results of this study of linguistic insecurity in Puerto Rico attest that among the middle class, public school teachers and students who served as Ss, society attaches no onus to speaking well. The results also indicate pervasive linguistic insecurity. Such hypercorrected terms as **fiso*, **finudo*, and **fisnudo* (<fine 'fine spoken' have apparently ceased to exert societal control over language use that is too fine.

Labov (1966:475) asserted a high incidence of linguistic insecurity in upwardly mobile societies. This research corroborated Labov's work in New York which found that the social changes (and vigor) of a society are harbingers of linguistic insecurity. In Puerto Rico, because of the mobility afforded the Ss

by industrialization, the people (the jibaro in particular) now move in new social situations which demand new societal roles, a new socialization through language. But in the transition from one life style to another, there have arisen new language roles and linguistic insecurity.

The transition of social roles, as it happened in England, demands new roles of the society and the society in turn demands an assurance of linguistic propriety from the curriculum, a propriety that is not forthcoming from the present Spanish language curriculum in Puerto Rico.

Evidence of linguistic insecurity was also brought out through the investigation of speech reference adscription. Labov (1966:476) found that New Yorkers most often claimed membership in a speech reference group of higher social status than that of their own. In this research, the teachers claimed to belong to a speech reference group of higher status than they were adscribed to by all Ss, as did the Ss from New Yorker. Labov (1966:475) found that for "most New Yorkers, the reference group for linguistic behavior is not any group of which they are members." The same avowal was found to be true of the Puerto Rican Ss of this study. Not only did the Ss place themselves in a linguistic reference group of which they were not members but also one group of Ss placed the others within a linguistic group which was not theirs, but which had a higher social status. To quote Fisher (1958:52) this classification appears to be an instance of a "protracted pursuit of an elite by an envious [insecure] mass and the consequent 'flight' of the elite."

The students place the teachers in the same higher-status reference group in which the teachers placed themselves. The students, on the other hand, claimed to belong to the lower class reference group. That is, although both groups of teachers and students place themselves in speech reference groups to which neither belonged, the students alone placed themselves in a group of lower linguistic and social status, with the ninth ranked publico driver group, but

not as low as within the libero group. This placement into a speech group that the students had marked as low may be explained from Baron's point of view on curriculum.

The data indicated that the students reject their teacher as Spanish speech models. And, because the students fail to find a model of convincing authority, they rank themselves with the lowest (lower class) speech group--though the the students had claimed middle class status.

Puerto Ricans might be expected to have assumed an ethnocentric, protective stance toward PRS, as a reaction to the frequent criticism in he published literature. That is, Puerto Ricans might feel that their use of language is justifiably "correct" if it responds to the dialectal norms of the community. However, this protective attitude was not demonstrated by the Ss, who expressed a desire for correctness above ethnicity. They preferred to be "correct" rather than ethnic in language usage. They stated that they would accept normative correction from their peers, the Puerto Rican upper class, and from other Hispanos. However, they would accept normative correction from other Hispanos only after consultation with written language norms such as dictionaries, even though they have little access to books of language norms. Furthermore, they find their teachers poor models of language use. The study showed no statistical difference between the teacher and student groups, in terms of linguistic insecurity; the students, as a group, showed only a slightly higher degree of insecurity than did the teachers. Linguistic insecurity is more prevalent among the females, while linguistic bravado is more prevalent among the males.

The objective data of this research indicated that while linguistic insecurity may exist at any linguistic level, it is more prevalent at the lexical level than at other levels of linguistic structure, and that the two groups of teachers and students are equally insecure at the same levels of

linguistic structure. The Ss feel secure in their use of grammar, but state that, although satisfied with the Spanish they speak, they are deficient in vocabulary. Although vocabulary size is not a universally stigmatizing language feature, in this study, that feature was pointed out as the most stigmatizing and as the source of their linguistic insecurity. This attitude toward the size of the vocabulary may stem from a Spanish curriculum which relies on the memorization of long lists of a decontextualized lexicon.

Probably, the students' perception of their speech is a result of a language curriculum which criticizes where it should teach and which begins teaching at the "perfection" level of the code. At present, an inverse relationship has begun to develop between age and lexical insecurity: younger Ss are more insecure, which may provide for a linguistic change. The Puerto Rican Spanish curriculum forces the students to conform to social demands without responding to the students' need for self expression and cognitive development, and overlooks the influence of social functions on language use. Obviously, the Puerto Rican Spanish language curriculum, fossilized in the 40s, now serves an audience other than that for which it was created.

In summary, the linguistic insecurity that the Ss have manifested in this part of the investigation can be considered to be a pervasive language attitude in Puerto Rico and can be used as the defining characteristic of the Puerto Rican speech community on the island--as suggested for the United States by Labov (1966). The linguistic insecurity of the Ss of this study can be attributed to such causes as the stereotyping of a dialect as inferior, a recent colonial past, the rise of a middle class, and to a curriculum based on prescriptive rules of correctness and language purity, both extracted from literary models.

NOTES

1. Some veterans became transportation entrepreneurs on an island where public transportation was scarce, operating públicos, a car privately owned but operated for comunal use to transport shoppers, peddlers, workers, or students to and from a town and its rural barrios, or from town to town. These drivers are called ~~choferes~~ públicos 'public drivers.' The current tendency is to unstigmatize the subgroup by calling them porteadores públicos 'public carriers.'
2. Owens (1983) empirically validated in Canada Labov's index of linguistic insecurity, as reported by Owens and Baker (1985).
3. A study investigating the best predictor variable for lexical insecurity and dialectal security is now in preparation (Betancourt & Phinney).
4. The jibaro is a Puerto Rican social type. Tumin and Feldman (1971: 461) say that "many quarters, from all social levels, express the sense that the relatively isolated, self-sufficient, dignified, and propertyless jibaro represents the true spirit of Puerto Rico in its best sense." The speech of the jibaro, however, is considered rustic and is made fun of.
5. Escarpenter's grammar text (1979) is now in use in the public schools of Puerto Rico. The text is based on traditional grammar teaching methods but includes a very difficult chapter on transformational syntax.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, Roger D. and Rudolph C. Troike (eds.). 1972. *Language and cultural diversity in American education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Arce de Vázquez, Margot. 1949. El español de Puerto Rico. *Asosante* vi:52-62.
- Atwood, Elmer Bagby & Archibald A. Hill (eds.). 1969. *Studies in language and cultural of the Middle Ages and later*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Baron, Dennis E. 1976. Linguistic insecurity: The effect of attitudes toward language production. *Flowers of evil*. ERIC ED 137 817.
- Betancourt, Francisco. 1976. *Language attitudes and language education in Arecibo, Puerto Rico*. Austin: The University of Texas dissertation.
- , 1985. Puerto Rican Spanish: Sociolinguistics. *Método y sentido: Revista del Departamento de Humanidades*. Aguadilla: Universidad de Puerto Rico: 1-20.
- Betancourt, Francisco & Marianne Phinney. Insecurity in dialectal and standard Spanish in Puerto Rico. (In preparation).
- Blishen, B. R. 1968. The construction and use of occupational class scale. *Canadian journal of economics*. 24:453-8.
- Bram, Joseph. 1966. *Language and society* (8th printing). New York: Random House.
- Carrasquillo, Ceferino. 1980. *Historical development of the Puerto Rican language curriculum during the twentieth century: 1900-1965*. New York: Ediciones Puerto Rico de autores nuevos.

- Cedergren, Henrietta C. Jonas. 1965. The phonology of Puerto Rican Spanish. Cornell University Thesis.
- Clark, Victor. 1900. Education in Puerto Rico. 56th Congress, First session. Senate document No. 363. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Columbia University, Teachers College, The Institute of Field Studies. 1950. *Public education and the future of Puerto Rico: A curriculum survey, 1948-1949*. New York: New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.
- d'Anglejan, Allyson & G. Richard Tucker. 1973. Sociolinguistic correlates of speech styles in Quebec. In Shuy & Fasold, pp. 1-27.
- Darnell, Regna (ed.). 1971. *Linguistic diversity in Canadian society*. Edmonton: Linguistic research, Inc.
- de Granda, Germán. 1969. *Transculturación e interferencia lingüística en el Puerto Rico contemporáneo (1898-1968)*. Segunda edición. Barcelona: Tipografía Miguza.
- de Madariaga, Salvador. 1966. Vamos al Khalahtahyood? *Revista de Occidente*. 36: 365.
- Dillard, J. L. 1969. Standard average foreing in Puerto Rican Spanish. In E. Bagby Atwood & Archibald A. Hill, pp 49-56.
- Escarpenter, José. 1979. *Introducción a la moderna gramática española*. Santurce, Puerto Rico: Talleres de Artes Gráficas del Departamento de Instrucción Pública del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico.
- Ferguson, Charles A. and S. B. Heath. 1981. *Language in the USA*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Fisher, John L. 1958. Social influences on the choice of a linguistic variant. *Word* 14:47-56.
- Hymes, Dell (ed.) 1971. *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge University Press. (Proceeding of a conference held in April 1968 at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica).
- Laberge, S., & Chaisson-Lavoie, M. (1971). Attitudes face au français parlé a Montréal et degrés de conscience de variables linguistiques. In R. Darnell (ed.), pp. 89-128.
- Labov, William. 1963. The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19:273-209.
- , 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- , 1970. *The study of nonstandard English*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lawton, David. 1971. The question of creolization in Puerto Rican Spanish. In Dell Hymes, p. 32.
- Leonard, Sterling A. 1962. *The doctrine of correctness in English usage*

- 1700-1800. New York: Russel and Russel.
- Lewis, Gordon K. 1974. Puerto Rico: Toward new consciousness. In Adalberto Lopez & James Petras. pp 455-69. (*Latin American Review of Books* 1.1:147, Spring 1973).
- López, Adalberto & James Petras (eds.) *Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in History and Society*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 455-69
- Martin-Betancourt, Mary E. 1983. The teaching of composition in English and Spanish in Puerto Rico: Curricular issues. New York: Fordham University MS.
- Morris, Marshall. 1981. *Saying and Meaning in Puerto Rico: Some problems in the ethnography of discourse*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Muñoz Hernández, Mariano. 1972. Hacia un análisis de la clase media puertorriqueña. In Rafael Ramírez, Barry Levine & Carlos Buitrago Ortiz. pp 12-30.
- Navarro, Tomás T. 1966. *El español en Puerto Rico: Contribución a la geografía lingüística hispanoamericana*. Segunda edición. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
- Owens, Thompson W. 1983. Indexing linguistic insecurity in Winnipeg. University of Victoria thesis.
- Owens, Thompson W. & Paul M. Baker. 1984. Linguistic insecurity in Winnipeg: Validation of a Canadian index of linguistic insecurity. *Language in society* 13, 337-50.
- Quintero Rivera, Ángel G. 1974. The development of social classes and political conflicts in Puerto Rico. In Adalberto Lopez & James Petras. pp. 195-213.
- Ramírez, Rafael, Barry Levine, & Carlos Buitrago Ortiz (eds.). 1972. *Problemas de desigualdad social en Puerto Rico*. Río Piedras: Librería Internacional.
- Sereno, Kenso. 1949. Boricua: A study of language, transculturation and politics. *Psychiatry*. 12.2:167-84.
- Shuy, Roger W. and R. W. Fasold (eds.) 1973. *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tumin, Melvin N. with Arnold S. Feldman. 1971. (2nd edn.). *Social class and social change in Puerto Rico*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.